

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 are currently pending in the present application, Claims 1-3 having been amended by way of the present amendment. No new matter has been added.<sup>1</sup>

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Geddes et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,560,945, hereinafter “Geddes”).

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 1, Claim 1 is directed to an envelope for recovering a used recording liquid cartridge, and has been amended to clarify that the inner layer and the outer layer are heat-sealed to achieve integration.

Geddes describes a perforated package made of a composite integral sheet material which has a first absorbent layer, a second printable layer and a water vapor impermeable, polymer layer interposed between the first and second layers. According to Geddes, the first and second layers are discontinuously, or spot bonded to the respective opposite sides of the layer which is interposed therebetween to form air pockets. Therefore, Geddes does not disclose “the inner layer and the outer layer are heat-sealed to achieve integration,” as recited in amended Claim 1.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 2, Claim 2 is directed to an envelope for recovering a used recording liquid cartridge, and has been amended to clarify that the inner layer and the middle layer are heat-sealed to achieve integration, and the outer layer is stuck to the middle layer.

As noted above, Geddes describes the first and second layers are discontinuously, or spot bonded to the respective opposite sides of the layer which is interposed therebetween to form air pockets. Therefore, Geddes does not disclose “the inner layer and the middle layer

---

<sup>1</sup> Support for the amendments to Claim 1 may be found at least on page 7, lines 17-19, and in Fig. 2. Support for the amendments to Claim 2 may be found at least on page 7, lines 17-19, page 8, lines 1-4, and in Fig. 3. Support for the amendments to Claim 3 may be found at least in Fig. 4.

are heat-sealed to achieve integration, and the outer layer is stuck to the middle layer,” as recited in amended Claim 2.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 3, Claim 3 is directed to an envelope for recovering a used recording liquid cartridge, and has been amended to clarify that an outer edge portion of a front part only of the main body is continuously extended over the reference line at both sides of the sealing portion.


Geddes describes a perforated bag having two major panels which are joined by four minor panels, as shown in Fig. 1. As seen in both Figs. 1 and 2, area 2E is created using a side panel (one of the four major panels that becomes the side of the pouch when the pouch is put together, as seen in Fig. 2). Indeed, Geddes describes that area 2E can be used by making a *preliminary* fold to *close* the bag and then by making a *second* fold to seal the area of glue 2E on the bottom panel of the bag to the glue area 2D on the top panel of the bag. It appears from Geddes that glue is not used on areas 2B and 2C when areas 2E and 2D are used (since the purpose of areas 2E and 2D is to keep glue from getting inside the bag). Thus, the preliminary fold is necessary to merely close the bag, whereas the secondary fold is used to further close the bag with glue. Moreover, when area 2E is folded over to area 2D, this would necessitate drawing the ends of the bag inward such that areas 2E and 2D can line up, as folding flatly along the opening of the bag would not result in area 2E reaching area 2D. Applicants respectfully submit Geddes is silent regarding “a foldable sealing portion capable of *sealing* an opening of the envelope *by folding at a reference line*” and “an outer edge portion of a *front part only* of the main body is *continuously* extended over the reference lines at both sides of the sealing portion,” as recited in amended Claim 3.

Since M.P.E.P. § 2131 requires for anticipation that each and every feature of the claimed invention must be disclosed in the reference, it is respectfully submitted that Geddes does not anticipate independent Claims 1-3.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussions, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



James J. Kulbaski

Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 34,648

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)